ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಪಡಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಪೂರ್ತ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು. ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯ ಬೆಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಳವೇನಾದರೂ ಆದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅಭಾವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉಂಟಾದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಪತ್ರಿಕಾ ವರದಿಯ ಆಸುಸಾರ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯ ಬೆಲೆ ಕಿಲೋಗೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ೩ರೂ.ಗೆ ಮೀರಿದರೆ ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಹಿಂದೆ ಮುಂದೆ ನೋಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಚ್ಚರಿಕೆಯನ್ನಿತ್ತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗಾದರೂ ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ರೇಷನ್ ಡಿಪೋಗಳ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ವಿತರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತೀರೋ ಹೇಗೇ ? ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಕೆ.ಜಿ.ಗೆ ೨–೭೦ ಎಂದು ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾವು ೩ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ೩ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ದರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ರಾಮೇಗೌಡ—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಕ್ಕರೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದರ ಸಂಗ್ರಹಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಿತರಣೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಲು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳೇ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇವೆ. ವಿತರಣೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮಾರಾಟದ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ಗಳು ಇವೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಪತೋಟಿ ಅವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಹೊರತು ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ವಿಶೇಷತಃ ವಾಗಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಕಕ್ಕಿಲಾಯ—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ವಿತರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಏರು ಪೇರು ಆಗದ ಹಾಗೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೀರಾ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ರಾಮೇಗೌಡ - ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಈ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಕ್ತ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇದೆ.

(*ii*) *re : Alienation of land in Contravention of the Provisions of Land Reforms Act by the Minister for Law, S.W. and B.C.*

2-00 P.M.

† SRI L. G. HAVANUR (Minister for Law, S. W. and B. C.).—I am running high temperature today. I had written a letter to the Speaker. Nevertheless since my subject is being discussed today, I have come. I may kindly be permitted to sit and make a statement. I have to say something as to how the Speaker is behaving with me and how the Revenue Minister is conducting himself. When my prestige is involved, the Speaker is treating me in a very casual and light manner.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—I raise a point of order. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ ೩೧೨ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—I have not yet made my statement. This is a preamble to my statement. You please listen to my speech. If there is anything wrong, I am prepared to withdraw it. I will sit down and speak or atleast give certain explanation as to how this matter came up to be discussed here. I want to tell the whole truth. Even if it comes down to my leaving this office or going out of this House, I do not mind it. But for the sake of truth, let me make a statement on how this subject came to be discussed. I am pained very much.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—I am on a point of order. ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ ೩೨ರ ಕೆಳಗೆ ವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸವೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ದಿನದ ಸಮಯ ಕೊಡಿ. ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಸಮಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿವು. ಇವತ್ತು ಇದು ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ ; ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ; ನಾನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—That question would not arise before I explain the matter. My reputation is likely to be affected by your speech. Without notice to me, this subject has come up.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಟಿ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಪ್ರಥಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ನನಗೆ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ; ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ನಮಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ. ಅವರು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ಅವರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅವರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ; ಅವರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ; ಈ ದಿಶೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾನಿಯಾಗದಂತೆ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಧರ್ಮ. ಅವರ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We have to follow the procedure laid down in the rules.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—That applies equally to the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Revenue Minister, as it applies to others.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Perfectly allright. I appeal to the Law Minister to be patient and let us conduct ourselves according to the rules. A notice was given by members including me regarding the matter and that matter has been admitted by the Speaker and included in the Agenda. As per the rules, the matter will have to be taken up and the Speaker has now called upon Sri J. H. Patel to make a preliminary statement as per the requirement of the rules. He will make a statement, the concerned Revenue Minister will give a reply.

As regards the personal affair of the Law Minister, he has got every right to give his explanation. If anything is affected individually, whether he is a member or a Minister, he has got every right to make a statement. After the matter is raised and the reply given by the Minister, if he feels that a perticular.....

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—Not after the damage is caused.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Hon'ble Minister for Law cannot dictate terms to this House. We have to follow the rules. When the matter is on the agenda, he cannot stop it.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—My complaint is against the Speaker and his office.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—The Speaker has included it in the agenda ; nobody can question the authority of the Speaker and this House. The Speaker has a sovereign authority to include a particular subject and permit discussion and we have to be guided by the decision of the Speaker. I humbly submit, let us follow the procedure ; let us not be excited whetever might be the provocation. The Law Minister has got every right to rebut the statement after it is made. Let the matter be discussed in a peaceful and proper atmosphere. Let the hon'ble member Sri J. H. Patel make a statement which will be replied to by the Revenue Minister.

SRI L. G. HAVANUR.—That would come only when I am given notice.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—This question relates to a transaction that has taken place. I am not going into the merits of the transaction. We will give notice if there is any contravention of any law We will be discussing every day so many things without giving notice.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೀಲ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರ ಮೇಲೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ರವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಅಲೋ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಕ್ಕೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ನಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾದರೂ, ಅದು ಏನು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ. ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಈಗ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಾನು ಈಗ ವಿಷಯ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ವಿಷಯ ಎಷ್ಟು ಗಹನವಾದುದು ಎಂಬುದು ತಮಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು,

SIR S. M. SHEERNALI CHANDRASHEKHAR.—Sir, I raise a point of order Under Rule 288, a member while speaking shall not make any personal charges against a member and shall not use offensive

expressions about the conduct or proceedings of Parliament or any State Legislature etc., Similarly, rule 289 says like this :

> "No allegation of a defamatory or increminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also the to Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply."

So, it is very clear according to Rules 288 and 289. He must give notice to the concerned person before that. I view of this fact, Mr. Havanur has no previous notice. Therefore, it cannot be taken on the floor of this House and cannot be discussed.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—Rule 289 says that "no allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker." I am required under the rules to give notice to the Hon'ble Speaker, which I have done.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALI CHANDRSHEKHAR.—And also to the concerned Minister.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—With due respect to my friend, I wolud like to say that this rule 289 does not apply to other the Minister or the Member of this House. This refers to a person who is not a Member. It reads like this :

> "No allegations of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be mode by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply."

Supposing we want to make an allegation aganist any officers who are not Members of the House or any other person who is not a Member of this House, then we will have to inform the Member. I am not going into the merits of the case. Under Rule 312 the Member has given notice to the Speaker, and the Speaker in turn has informed the Government. The Government is a collective body– whether it is the Revenue Minister or the Chief Minister. Sri Havanur is not a person here, but he is a part of the Government. The Government in this case has been informed. This is a matter to be raised under Rule 312. Once you include it in the agenda, it goes without saying. That it will be taken up. Unless the Government gives a reply and tells the Speaker that they are ready with facts, the Hon'ble Speaker will not include the other day. The very same fact, is in the agenda. The

Revenue Minister also said He said that the concerned Minister was ill- as this may be taken up later. But what I which to say is that there is no need to for him to come. Ofcourse, it is left to Sri Hanumanthappa to say that he wanted notice or that the Legislature has not informed him. But so far as the procedure is concerned, what you have adopted is correct. Let us not read in between lines and say that the Minister is not given notice etc., Whatever, the Minister wants to say, he can do so while giving his explanation. The Minister said thus he has been treated casually by the Legislature Secretariat. He has the right to say all those things. If you want to deviate from the procedure, I leave it to the House. But the procedure that you have adopted is perfectly in order. Therefore, I am saying that the procedure adopted is perfectly in order. Since you have called Sri J. H. Patel to speak, you will have to kindly permit him to raise the matter. I only appeal that the Minister has got the right to reply wherein he can bring all the facts as to how he was treated and how it has motivated etc. He has got the right to say that. But under rule 312 the Member can raise it and the Minister has got the right to reply.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALI CHANDRASHEKHAR.—Sir, Rule 288 (ii) is very clear. The Minister is not a Member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER.—Though he is not a Member of this House, he is a Member of the Cabinet and he has got the right to participate in the proceedings of this House.

SRI S. M. SHEERANALY CHANDRASEKHAR.—As per rule 288(2) a member shall not make a personal charge against a member.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಈ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಕೇಳಕೇಳಿ ಸಾಕಾಯಿತು. ರೂಲ್-ಬಿಯನ್ನು ಎರವರಡ ಸಲ ಓದಿಯಾಯಿತು. ಈಗ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

SRI S. M. SHEERANALI CHANDRASEKHAR.—I want a ruling from the Hon. Chair.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

† SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, with your permission I wish to submit that the notice that is now given is under rule 312. This rule says that a member who wishes to bring to the notice of the Assembly any matter which is not a point of order shall give notice to the Secretary in writing briefly the point which he wishes to raise in the Assembly together with reasons for wishing to raise it and he shall be permitted to raise it only after the Speaker has given his consent and at such time and date as the Speaker may fix. Now, the hon. member who has wished to raise the point under rule 312 has given in writing to the Speaker through the Secretary. To that extent, nobody can object. You will have certainly gone through this notice under

rule 312 wherein there is a definite allegation against a member, who is the Minister. A definite charge also is made. He cannot now say there is no charge, there is no defamation and there is no such thing. It is there in writing. It is not a regular motion like other motions but he has brought it to the notice of the Assembly through you under the rules. Another point we have to bear in mind will be that the notice contains a specific charge against the Minister. If he wants to speak, then comes this rule 289, ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE PERSON. Then rule 288 relates to the rules to be observed while speaking, Now, the hon. member may argue "Yes, under rule 312 I have raised a point of allegation; so, the question of my giving previous notice does not arise and therefore, I shall speak on this". I do not know whether it is possible under rules 288 and 289 to prevent the hon. member from making these charges. He says he has already given notice. Rule 289 says that no allegation of a defamatory or discriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation. This 'person' includes both members inside the House as well as outside the House. It says "unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned". It might be argued that the subject-matter belongs to the Revenue Department or the Revenue Minister is concerned. But the allegation is against a Minister other than the Revenue Minister. The rule further says intimation may be given to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of reply.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—You are trying to defend a very bad case.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am trying to say what it means. You cannot be too clever. I know you are very clever. I can also be as clever. With the permission of the Speaker, I am speaking. ಈಗ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸಾಬೀತಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಾಬೀತಾದರೆ the person concerned will have to take the consequences. We are not afraid. Please do not be in a hurry; much less Sri H.Vanur is afraid of all these things.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೀಲ್.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಷ್ಟ ಏನೆಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಕಷ್ಟವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ತಂದಿರುವ ವಿಧಾನ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂತಹ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟಬಂದಂತೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಇದನ್ನು ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಂದು ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಂ ಪಾದ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಅಜೆಂಡಾ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೇ ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂಬ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲೇ ವೆರಿಫೈ ಮಾಡ

ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಅಂಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹಂತದಲ್ಲಿ...

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS. - I want to submit to the House whether it is fully relevant now and whether it fully satisfies all the regulations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್:—ನಿಯಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಅಜೆಂಡಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—That does not matter. There are so many matters which are brought on the agenda; sometimes, they will have been discussed and sometimes, they will have been postponed. The moment a matter is brought in the agenda it may not be taken up. If the House agrees it may be postponed. I would only appeal to him to have some patience. I am not trying to prevent him from bringing this. We are not trying to escape. Whatever onslaught you may be proposing to do, we are prepared to face. But the Minister concerned says he has no knowledge of it. That is what I am trying to submit to you. The fact is it is an allegation against Sri Havanur who is a Minister. Now, how to deal with this matter, one has to carefully consider. The Minister says 'I am not aware of this'. Supposing he says he is not aware of this, I would only want to know whether simply because the matter has been brought before this House and now that it is a definite Matter, allegation against him, whether it is not fair on our part including Sri Patel, to give the Minister some time.

I am not trying to escape or get away or somehow subvert the rules. None of those things I am doing. If it was any other matter, that is a different question. One hon member has not only raised a point under Rule 312 but also sought to bring a definite allegation against the Hon. Minister. When the Hon. Minister is concerned in this allegation, the only point is, should he not be given notice of it? Alright, notice is not given. The hon. member is showing me a copy of the letter that he has written to the Hon. Speaker. What I am submitting is, the Minister has written a letter to the Hon. Speaker. I don't want to go into it.

SRI. J. H. PATEL.—Which Minister?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—He has written.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—He is aware of it.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Shall I read it?

I am not taking it as a matter of right, to read this. If you object, certainly I don't want to read. He has written like this to the Hon. Speaker;—

"When the Assembly business for to-day was circulated yesterday night I came to know that some Hon. Members like J. H Patel, Bhavu Rao Deshpande, S. R. Bommai had raised a matter under Rule 312 regarding my selling of certain lands which in the opinion of the said Hon. Members was in contravention of the Land Reforms Act. I immedatsly contacted the Hon. Revenue Minister Sri B. Basavalingappa to know if he was going to make a statement in the Assembly and if he had received any intimation from the Speaker. The Hon. Minister said that he did not know anything about the said matter under Rule 312. Since the matter directly concerns me you should have sent a copy of the notice under Rule 312 and obtained my say. Rules of natural justice require that before any such matter, particularly effecting the reputation of a person like me is sought to be discussed notice should be given or an opportunity to explain his conduct be given. In the instant case, you have admitted the matter without notice and you have also included the said matter in the agenda without notice to me.

Coming to the contents of the notice under Rule 312, I should say that the Hon. Members are either misinformed by some who are inimically disposed towards me on political and caste consideration.

Finally he has stated as follows:—

"After my return from Dharwar on the 16th Morning I fell ill and I express my inability to attend the Session."

This is dated 23rd August, 1978 *i.e.*, day before yesterday. Some portions which are connected directly with the subject matter you have raised, I have omitted reading because, as you correctly mentioned, I don't like to read the whole thing. At the appropriate time, he will do it or from the Government side, we are going to do it.

Now the question is with regard to the point the Minister has raised the point that he has to be made aware of it so that he can prepare his case. Now whatever it is, the Hon. Speaker was pleased to put it in the agenda and he has also called the Members. This is the situation where we are now. The Minister says that he is not aware of it. This is an allegation against him. Under these circumstances, I leave it to the sense of the House and the Hon. Speaker whether we should still insist that the matter should be raised now or

some time later it may be tomorrow but it does not mean that it will be postponed to another Session. I know the moment we suggest, anybody will say that we are trying to escape out of it. Therefore, in all fairness, under the circumstances explained by the member concerned or the Minister coneenred, I would only take a suggestion for your consideration. We have requested the Hon. Leader of the Opposition as well to sit for some time tomorrow to pass a very important Bill which he was good enough to agree; otherwise, we should have closed today. Tomorrow, it could be taken up. Now the Minister can take notice of it and let him come prepared. Let him raise the issue and let us discuss.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI —So far as the last request of the Hon. Chief Minister is concerned, it deserves to be considered but as already pointed out by the hon. Member Sri Arumugam, Rule No. 89 is very clear. The Member has to give notice to the Hon. Speaker and the Legislature Secretariat should give notice to the Minister concerned and in this case, the notice has been given to the Minister, concerned, It could be interpreted in both the ways as mentioned by the Hon Chief Minister. The Minister concerned may be the Minister holding the portfolio or the Minister against whom the allegation is made. Two constructions are possible, I don't deny that but the Legislature Secretariat has acted properly; now from the letter that has been addressed to the Hon. Speaker and read by the Hon. Chief Minister, it is quite clear that the Hon. Law Minister has a notice of the matter on the 23rd instant. The metter was in the agenda dated 23rd instant. The Hon. Revenue Minister has requested to give time to contact the Hon. Law Minister and to discnss this matter with him and we have agreed to it. So, it was in the agenda dated 23rd instant The Revenne Minister has promised to give some documents also. Therefore, he requested some time to contact him and to take instructions on this matter. We have agreed to it. It is a correct thing because the Hon, Minister was sick and the matter cnncerned him. Therefore, the Hon. Revenue Minister was right in asking time

So far as the rule is concerned, all the procedures and formalities have been completed and the Hon Speaker was right in putting it in the agenda. I will not go to the technicalities so far as the rule is concerned. Now the Hon. Leader of the House has asked time till tomorrow, we agree for it. Let the matter be taken up tomorrew but at the same time I would like to say that rules are being followed and there is no necessity of giving notice to the Hon, Minister against whom the allegation is made. It has to go to the Minister who is holding the portfolio.

SRI D DEVARAJ URS.—The only point is, as myself stated, I am not trying to contend against the reasoning of the Hon Leader of the Opposition. Now or some time later, the rule will have to be made more specific or some rule will have to be provided. Strictly speaking, these matters cannot be brought under Rule No. 312. Rightly or wrongly, we have been going on. Any kind of matter is brought under Rule No. 312. Instead of a regular motion, the hon. Member has brought this allegation itself under Rule No.312. If it was not an allegation but some point which has to be clarified or which has to be brought to the notice of the House, then, I agree. But, here, it is something more than a point to be made. It is also an allegation against a Minister. I think that, you will appreciate. I am not trying to assert and say that notice should have gone to the minister.

But it is still a moot point wheather the notice should have gone to him or not because under rule 312 the Hon. Member has sought to bring a definite charge against the Minister. Therefore the Hon. Minister should have been given sufficient time to give information. about this. He has written a letter. You will also appreciate my point supposing a charge is brought against a member, let alone a Minister, if notice is given to him he may reply. Here, because of rule 312 unless the Hon. Speaker permits, he cannot raise any issue under rule 312. It is the Hon. Speaker who has to fix the date and time either to allow or disallow it. Sir, supposing I make a charge against a Member or somebody, and even after the Hon. Speaker gets necessary information or explanation from the Member he may still consider in his discretion whether to admit the notice or not. This is the point. Under rule 312, admision of a notice depends upon the nature of the information or explantion given by the person concerned. It is also a moot point to consider whether a notice should have been given to the Minister. I think this matter need not be contended now. Now, that the Hon. Leader of the opposition has for taking up this matter later, I want this House to take note of making the rules more clear. This is the point I wanted to submit to the House. Sir, as I have already said this matter could be raised tomorrow and the Minister will answer the points.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಲೀಡರ್ ಅವರು ನಾಳೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಇರುಪಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಹಳ ಕೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಆರೋಗ್ಯ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.—ನಿಮಗಿಂತಲೂ ಆರೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಎಚ್. ಪಟೇಲ್.—ನಾಳೆಗೆ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Since the Minister has said that he is running temparature, and that a copy of the notice has not been given to him, I have asked my office to him a copy today, Let the Hon. Minister study them and have his say in the matter. Now, let us go to the next item.

Reported statement by the Minister for law S. W. and BC's reg. purdah system among Muslim Women

SRI QUMARUL ISLAM.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have given an assurance that we can take up this issue after the Hon. Minister comes to the House. Since the Hon. Law Minister is in the House we can take up the matter relating to the statement issued by him.

MR. SPEAKER.—That is also postponed because the Hon. Minister is a running temparature.

SRI QUMARUL ISLAM.—Sir, we have give notice under rule.....

SRI G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fail to understand... why I did not catch your eye.....

MR. SPEAKER.—Two Members cannot speak at a time

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am in a favourable position to catch the eye of the speaker. On this issue my submission is the Hon. Chief Minister has said it could be taken up tomorrow and we have agreed. Now, I am only submitting that the Hon. Minister inspite of the fact he was ill, has written a letter to the Hon. Speaker. I would like to know why the Hon. Minister was not informed. When the Hon. Minister has written a letter the speaker, it also forms a part of the proceedings of the House. The correspondance between the speaker and the Minister was read.....

MR. SPEAKER.—It is a cyclostyled matter. It is not a letter.

SRI C. M. ARMUGHAM.—Whatever it is, forms a part of the proceedings. I would like to know why the Hon. Minister was not supplied or with the information. This is my point. The Hon. Minister has written a letter to you about it. Inspite of his letter, he was not given the information. I would like to know why he was not given the information.

MR. SPEAKER.—As already decided we will supply the information. Let the Hon. Minister read them and say whatever he wants to say in the matter. Let us go to the next subject.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಂ. ಇಬ್ರಾಹಿಂ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದು ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ನೋಟಿಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರ್ದೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಸದನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಹಾವನೂರ್ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು